UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,008	12/21/2000	Robert G. Schaefer	PM 0272835	6665

909 7590 07/15/2003

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
LEE, CHI CHUNG	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/741,008	SCHAEFER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chi-Chung E Lee	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-65* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-65* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. **Claims 1-7, 9-16, 18, 28-33, 37-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** because **the subject matter** is directed to **non-statutory subject matter.**

Claims 1, 10 are directed to non-functional descriptive data. It does not fall within the statutory classes listed in 35 U.S.C. 101. The application program interface apparatus/method is a layer of computer programs (i.e. code or software), see page 4 lines 2-3, comprising means, which are software components, for receiving and transmitting the data, means for managing communication connections and means for checking the security, see page 9 lines 10-17.

Claims **2, 11** add additional software elements recited in claim 1 and 10. Thus they also recite non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 3-7,9, 12-16, 18 recite further details of software recited in claim 1 and 10. Thus they also recite non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 28, 31 are directed to non-functional descriptive data. It does not fall within the statutory classes listed in 35 U.S.C. 101. The data view apparatus/method is the mapping and stored procedures (i.e. software), see page 4 lines 5-6, comprising means for receiving and transmitting the data; means for extracting data from the database or writing data in the target database, see page 9 lines 10-17. Notice non-tangible elements recited. The examiner suggests the applicant to amend the claims comprising tangible element to overcome 101 issues.

Claims 29-30, 32-33 recite further details of software recited in claim 28 and 31. Thus they also recite non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 37, 48 are directed to non-functional descriptive data. It does not fall within the statutory classes listed in 35 U.S.C. 101. The data interchange system/method comprises API (i.e. is a layer of computer programs), see page 4 lines 5-6; the access component; the system domain; the system domain with means to receive and transmit data; the interface component and the database, which are software components.

Claims **38, 43, 49** add additional software elements recited in claim 37 and 48. Thus they also recite non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 39-42, 44-47, 50-56 recite further details of software recited in claim 37 and 48. Thus they also recite non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-9, 10-18, 19-27, 37-47, 48-56, 57-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the security authorization" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 sections 'c'-'d', claim 10 sections 'c'-'d', claim 19 sections 'c'-'d', claim 37 sections 'c'-'d', claim 48 sections 'c'-'d' and claim 57 sections 'c'-'d' recite use of "the data request". The antecedent basis for this phrase is "read data request" or "write data request". However these claims also recite receipt of a "request to perform an operation" listed in the section 'a'. No use of means to check security or means/steps to transmit is made for the operation request. The examiner asserts that failure to recite use of these means/steps for the operation request makes unclear if the applicant intents for this data to be processed by these means. Thus the scope of the claim is unclear. For purposes of applying art, the examiner assumes that means/steps for checking and means/steps for transmitting process the operation request as well.

Claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-27, 38-47, 49-56, 58-65 are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-65 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck (US 6,167,395 A) in view of Lee et al (US 6,493,752 B1).

As per claim 1, Beck discloses an API apparatus comprising:

a) means for receiving a data request (i.e. incoming DNT calls and other communication events) from a client application regarding a target database,75, see figure 1 and column 6 lines 59-61;

b) means for managing communications connections and request queues (i.e. CINOS to route DNT calls directly over LAN 55 according to existing routing rules to PC/VDU respectively), see column 6 lines 62-67 and column 8 line 66-column 8 line 2;

c) a first means (i.e. routing server 29 within communication center 25) is used to identify the customer and media type (i.e. security authorization and control associated with the data request), see column 12 lines 43-48 and figure 2;

d,e) means for transmitting the data request and receiving the data response (i.e. LAN 55), see figure 1;

g) means for transmitting the data response to the client application (i.e. outbound dialing campaigns wherein recorded information is given to the customer), see column 10 lines 29-39.

Beck discloses the routing server 29 does inbound validation. However, Beck does not expressly disclose the second means for checking the security authorization and control associated with data response.

Lee teaches the security device 100 [figure 3] is in a position to control and monitor transaction and reception of network traffic. The SMS station 324 configures the security device 100 to implement a more detailed security screen for incoming and outgoing (i.e. data response) network traffic, see column 1 lines 49-59 and column 5 lines 1-14.

It would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to further program the RTN 29 to handle the outbound traffic checking as disclosed in Lee.

The motivation is to allow the RTN 29 to perform both the data request (i.e. inbound) checking/validation and the data response (i.e. outbound) checking/validation.

As per claim 2, Beck discloses the content analysis 89 (i.e. monitoring means) of workflow layer 85 wherein textual analysis, voice analysis (i.e. to monitor all received data requests and all data response), see column 11 line 66 – column 12 line 2.

As per claim 3, Beck discloses the client application is selected from retailed applications (i.e. store and server information relevant to purchase history, product preferences of customers, see column 8 lines 1-8.

As per claims 4,5, 6, Beck discloses the first means and the second means (i.e. CINOS) for checking security authorization of the data request use identification authentication (i.e. use assigned number that identify the customer), see column 22 lines 49-65. Beck discloses all transactions are recorded and stored in mass storage device handled by one or more database application (i.e. stored as a audit list in DB for tracking transactions, see column 12 lines 49-54.

As per claim 7, Beck discloses the client application [115] has file structure that is selected from the application specific structures, HTML, see column 13 lines 55-67.

As per claim 8, Beck discloses the data request and data transmission are transmitted electronically using the local area network [55], see figure 1.

As per claim 9, Beck discloses the network applications interact with various business objects using COM, ODBC and SQL; see column 14 lines 24-28.

As per claims 10-18, the claimed steps corresponds to the functions of the elements of the apparatus claims 1-9, which have been rejected above, and thus rejected with the same reason applied thereto.

As per claim 19, Beck discloses an interaction object model (IOM) 253 functions as a memory based interface-engine (i.e. a data storage medium) containing instructions which, when executed on a CINOS systems (i.e. a programmable apparatus) will cause the CINOS system to perform an application interfacing to a mass repository 253, see column 30 lines 21-32. The method comprising:

a) Receiving a data request [step 277] from a data-interaction system, see column 32 lines 30-32 and figure 13.

b) Managing communications connections and request queues [step 279, the IOM is activated to receive commands], see column 32 lines 32-37.

c) IOM performs the requested function by checking security authorization [step 283] (i.e. identify client's last five interactions) and control associated with the data request (i.e. to determine a best fit agent to accept the new interaction), see column 32 lines 38-46.

d) Transmit the data request to mass repository 263, see figure 13

e,f,g) Receiving a data response and transmitting the response to the client applications [255-261] by displaying the results to the request systems, see column 32 lines 55-61.

Beck discloses the routing server 29 does data request (i.e. inbound) validation. However, Beck does not expressly disclose the second means for checking the security authorization and control associated with data response.

Lee teaches the security device 100 [figure 3] is in a position to control and monitor transaction and reception of network traffic. The SMS station 324 configures the security device 100 to implement a more detailed security screen for incoming and outgoing (i.e. data response) network traffic [see column 1 lines 49-59 and column 5 lines 1-14].

It would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to further program the RTN 29 to handle the outbound traffic checking as disclosed in Lee.

The motivation is to allow the RTN 29 to perform both the data request (i.e. inbound) checking/validation and the data response (i.e. outbound) checking /validation.

As per claim 20, Beck discloses a display function 269 is adapted to enable data results to be displayed on suitable screen monitors (i.e. monitoring all received requests and all data response), see column 31 lines 1-6.

As per claim 21, Beck discloses the client application is a bank application (i.e. loan application), see figure 14.

As per claim 22,23, 24, Beck discloses the first and second checking for security authorization use identification authentication (i.e. a completed copy of the loan application associated with the client's ID), see column 37 lines 61-64. Beck discloses an audit list (i.e. loan application table) of data request (i.e. incoming call) for tracking transactions, see figure 14.

As per claim 25, Beck discloses the IOM is a COM –based model interface and is run in much the same way as a standard relational object model (i.e. relational database), see column 31 lines 22-24.

As per claim 26, Beck discloses the data request and data transmission are transmitted electronically using the local area network [55], see figure 1.

As per claim 27, Beck discloses the network applications interact with various business objects using COM, ODBC and SQL; see column 14 lines 24-28.

Claims 57-65 have similar limitations as claims 19-27; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 28, Beck discloses the interface component, IOM, (i.e. data view) apparatus comprising:

a) means (API function) for receiving a read data request, see column 30 lines 21-33;

b) means (search function) fro extracting data from the MIS database, see column 30 lines 62-67;

c) means for writing data and transmitting the data responses (Display function) to the suitable screen monitor, see column 31 lines 1-12.

However, Beck does not disclose mapping and performing stored procedures upon the extracted data to build a data response to the read data request. It would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the unique convention (i.e. mapping) provides a system accessible abstract of all stored interactions, see column 30 lines 14-19.

As per claim 29, Beck discloses the client application is a bank application (i.e. loan application), see figure 14.

As per claim 30, Beck discloses the network applications interact with various business objects using COM, ODBC and SQL; see column 14 lines 24-28.

As per claims 31-33, the claimed steps corresponds to the functions of the elements of the apparatus claims 28-30, which have been rejected above, and thus rejected with the same reason applied thereto.

Claims 34-36 have similar limitations as claims 28-30; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 37-47 have similar limitations as claims 1-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claims 48-56, the claimed steps corresponds to the functions of the elements of the apparatus claims 37-47, which have been rejected above, and thus rejected with the same reason applied thereto.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chi-Chung E Lee whose telephone number is 703-306-4153. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 5 pm, Mon. - Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Chi-Chung Lee
July 10, 2003

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100